

RADICAL BOOKS

On

Economics, History, Social Sciences,
Psychology, Evolution and Revolution

Superstition and ignorance is protected by the privileged
classes who live on the labor of others. Modern Science
and revolutionary ideas are welcomed by the workers who
keep society alive.

Catalogues describing books from the
workers' view-point sent on request.

SEND
your books needs to the

LITERATURE DEPARTMENT

Workers Party of America
1113 W. Washington Blvd., Chicago

1 4

PARTIES AND ISSUES IN THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN

By Alexander Bittelman



PRICE 10 CENTS

Published by
LITERATURE DEPARTMENT

Workers Party of America,
Washington Blvd.,
Chicago, Ill.

290

1-41



711
B58
1924

THE DAILY WORKER

America's Great Labor Daily

reports from day to day the doings of the worker's world
as no other paper in the English language can or will.



Every reader of this book must read

THE DAILY WORKER

Every Day

to keep posted on the subject covered so well in this
book.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES By mail

1 year.....	\$6.00
6 mos.	3.50
3 mos.	2.00

In Chicago by mail

1 year.....	\$6.00
6 mos.	4.50
3 mos.	2.50

THE DAILY WORKER,
1113 W. Washington St.,
Chicago, Ill.

Enclosed please find \$.....
for.....Months' subscription to
THE DAILY WORKER.

Name

Street..... Flat.....

City..... State.....

Spec 1, labd
40452542
Gabra
6/25/01

FOREWORD

The purpose of this pamphlet is to establish and formulate the real issues of this election campaign and to show the attitude of the various political parties towards them.

An election campaign, no matter how important, seldom settles matters. It merely enables the various classes and groups better to mobilize their forces for future struggles inside and outside of the legislative and executive organs of the government.

It is in this way that the election campaign must be utilized by the workers and poor farmers of this country if they are to gain anything at all by participating in the coming election.

But in order to achieve this end, the toiling masses must make sure that they possess a clear and definite understanding of the problems confronting them and of the real issues that are at stake between themselves and the capitalist exploiters.

The following is an attempt, by means of questions and answers, to show the attitude of each social group and their respective political parties to the fundamental as well as immediate questions that are determining the present day class struggle in the United States.

1. What are the main parties and political groupings at present in the United States?

- A. The Republican Party.
- B. The Democratic Party.
- C. The Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.
- D. The Workers (Communist) Party.

2. What class of people do these parties represent? In whose interests are they speaking and fighting?

The Republican Party.—Large bankers, industrialists and merchants. Wall Street. Grain and other speculators. Rich farmers. Rich middle classes of the western cities.

The Democratic Party.—Big capital and Wall Street, plus the landholding aristocracy of the south, plus the rich middle classes of the eastern cities.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—Small bankers, merchants, and manufacturers. More or less well-to-do farmers. The so-called liberal petty bourgeoisie, and the labor aristocracy and labor bureaucracy who have submitted to a bourgeois point of view.

Workers Party.—Class conscious workers, the wage-earning proletariat, and the poorest sections of the farmers.

3. What is their attitude to capitalist control and exploitation of the wealth of the nation?

Republican Party.—Absolutely in favor of it. Determined to maintain this control by all means and at all costs.

Democratic Party.—The same attitude. Only when they are out of office they are prone to shed a tear for the "common people" in order that the latter assist them in getting back into office. That's what's happening in the present election campaign.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—In favor of it. Only this system of capitalist control must be so modified as to permit the small capitalist a larger share of the total profits which are being squeezed out of the toiling masses. That's

what is meant by "busting the trusts" and by going "back to 1776."

Remark.—The Socialist Party, which forms part of the alliance, is committed by its program to the abolition of the present system. But since it discarded the class struggle, which is the only means of bringing about such a change, and since it surrendered to LaFollette-Gompers, and accepted their leadership, the Socialist Party must be placed in the same column as Gompers and LaFollette.

Workers Party.—Unconditionally and unalterably opposed to it. Determined to spare no efforts in educating and organizing the working class for a revolutionary struggle for power, which, when secured, will enable the toiling masses to abolish the present system and to restore the wealth of the nation to those who produce it.

4. Shall the people take over the ownership, control, and management of the banks, railroads, coal mines, grain elevators, and all other monopolistic organizations of capital?

Republican Party.—No, under no circumstances. Because this will spell the end to the profits and power of the capitalist class.

Democratic Party.—The same attitude.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—No, not exactly in this way. And then there is some difference of opinion in our family on the entire proposition. Gompers will have none of it. LaFollette, on the other hand, would favor public ownership for some, and public control for other monopolized enterprises, but he refuses to say who the public is to be: the capitalists alone, the producers alone, or both together. And the Socialists, whose program calls for the nationalization of industries, have surrendered to Gompers and LaFollette, consequently, their program does not count.

Workers Party.—Yes. By organizing an independent political party of workers and poor farmers and by waging a struggle for the establishment of a workers and farmers government.

5. To whom shall belong the land?

Republican Party.—To the capitalist corporations, and to the rich farmers.

Democratic Party.—The same attitude.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—To those who hold it.

Workers Party.—To the users. To those who till it.



6. What form of government do they favor?

Republican Party.—Preferably the present form of government, which because of its democratic camouflage, very effectively conceals its real nature, which is a capitalist dictatorship. Should, however, this present sham democracy prove incapable of coping with the growing urge of the masses to power, we shall discard the mask of democracy and will function as an open capitalist dictatorship, on the style of Mussolini's Fascisti regime in Italy, for which regime Morgan, Gary, and Dawes, have already expressed their unbounded admiration.

Democratic Party.—The same attitude.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—The present capitalist form of government. Only its machinery should be managed by people of liberal views who believe in the constitution.

Workers Party.—A soviet form of government. A workers and farmers government. A government which will disarm the capitalists and arm the working class.

7. What do they propose to do to prevent the repetition of Teapot Dome and similar practices?

Republican Party.—Nothing. They will keep altogether quiet about Denby, Fall, and Daugherty, and will continue praising to the skies the uprightness, honesty, and integrity of their standard-bearer, Calvin Coolidge.

Democratic Party.—During the campaign they will violently attack the Republican administration for the oil and other scandals. They will quite naturally forget the oil record of McAdoo. And if they get into office they will maintain the same system of government with all the consequences that this system produces.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—They will place the guilt for Teapot Dome at the doors of both old parties. They will explain the reason for these scandals by the fact that the two old parties are controlled by special privilege and by monopolized capital. And they will maintain that the only way to prevent the repetition of such scandals is by electing an "honest government," that is, a government controlled by smaller capitalists.

Workers Party.—Teapot Dome is a natural product of the present system of government, which is a government by and for the capitalists. Teapot Dome is no more scandalous and outrageous than the bloody profiteering during the war, or the ruination of the working class youth by murderously

exploiting child labor, or the eviction of strikers from their homes, or the suppression of strikes by injunction and military force. Teapot Dome is just as natural and "beautiful" a flower as any of the manifold brutalities of capitalist rule. The way to prevent the occurrence of Teapot Dome and similar practices is for the workers and poor farmers to wrest the power out of the hands of the capitalists and establish a government of their own.

8. What do they think of "law and order?"

Republican Party.—In favor of it. That is to say, law and order must be always enforced in the interests of the capitalists, which means to keep the toiling masses in subjection and to enable the capitalists to extract from the masses the maximum amount of profit. Any attempt by the masses to resist exploitation, whether by strikes, demonstrations, or otherwise, is to be considered a serious menace to law and order and mercilessly suppressed.

Democratic Party.—The same attitude.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—In favor of it, with certain modifications. Namely, that law and order be enforced with a sense of impartiality and that capital and labor both be held equally responsible before the law. But when the exploited masses begin showing signs of unreasonableness, thus endangering the present capitalist order of society, then, of course, the government is in duty bound to enforce "law and order" in the interests of the capitalists.

Workers Party.—Unalterably opposed to capitalist law and order. As long as the capitalists continue in power, law and order can mean nothing else but the subjection of the masses in the interests of capitalist exploitation. We favor only one kind of law and order, the kind that will be established by a workers and farmers government.

9. Shall the workers have a right to organize and strike?

Republican Party.—No, absolutely not, if we can help it.

Democratic Party.—The same attitude.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—Yes, but with the following reservations: That the labor organizations refrain as much as possible from going into strikes and that instead they better come to an agreement with the bosses for peaceful and harmonious co-operation, even at the cost of sacrificing the interests of labor, particularly those sections that are considered unskilled and are, as a rule, unorganized.

Workers Party.—Yes, absolutely so. The workers must

be organized, all the workers—skilled and unskilled. They should use the strike as extensively as possible in defense of their interests, irrespective of how much this may hurt the capitalists. Or, rather, the more it hurts the better, because it is only by hurting the capitalists that the workers can hope to get something for themselves and their families.

10. Shall we permit the eviction of strikers from their homes if the latter happen to be owned by the capitalists?

Republican Party.—Sure. Private property is sacred. It must be protected always and at all costs. Incidentally, the eviction of strikers from their homes has proven to be a powerful weapon for breaking strikes and for driving the workers back into slavery.

Democratic Party.—The same attitude.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—We believe in the right of private property. However, we should try in all cases where it becomes necessary to evict strikers, speedily to adjust the conflict thus avoiding unpleasant consequences for everyone concerned.

Workers Party.—No, under no circumstances. The workers and their organizations should have the right to resist eviction by force. A law should immediately be enacted making eviction a serious crime to be punished as severely, at least, as robbery or burglary.

11. Shall we permit the use of the police, militia, federal troops and company gunmen to drive striking workmen back to work?

Republican Party.—Yes, by all means. Law and order demands that this be done.

Democratic Party.—The same attitude.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—No. That's too brutal a way of settling strikes, particularly such strikes as do not directly and immediately endanger the existing capitalist order of society. If the military is to be used at all in labor disputes, it should be done in a manner "impartial" to both sides. In practice this means in favor of the capitalists.

Workers Party.—No. A law should be passed forbidding the use of the police and the military in labor disputes. The use of company gunmen should be outlawed and punished the same as murder in the first degree. In addition, the entire organized labor movement must stand ready with all its resources to fight against the use of the military for strike-breaking purposes.

12. Shall we permit the courts to issue injunctions against strikes?

Republican Party.—Yes. It's a good weapon to fight the workers.

Democratic Party.—The same attitude.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—No. But as long as the courts enjoy the right to issue injunctions, the workers must be careful not to defy the courts. Because to defy the courts means to fight the government, and no patriotic American working man would think of fighting "his" government.

Workers Party.—No. With no buts about it. Only the organized and active opposition of the labor movement against the use of injunctions will put a stop to this outrageous practice.

13. Shall we enact special legislation to outlaw and persecute foreign born workers?

Republican Party.—Yes, but we must not put it that way. We must do all in our power to terrorize the foreign born workers, frighten them away from unions and strikes and prevent them generally from uniting with the native workers in common struggles against the capitalists. Such laws as, for instance, registering, photographing and finger-printing the foreign born workers would go a long way towards the destruction of the American labor movement.

Democratic Party.—The same attitude.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—We are not quite united on that. LaFollette wouldn't mind it. The small capitalists and rich farmers whom he represents have no particular sympathy for the labor movement. Gompers, who, by the nature of his position is compelled to render some measure of lip-service to the labor movement, will say, of course, that he is against it. But he, too, has no use for the masses of foreign born workers, and will, therefore, do what he did so far, that is, nothing, to protect the foreign born workers from persecutions. The Socialists are committed to fight, but, having surrendered to Gompers and LaFollette, they don't count.

Workers Party.—No. We shall fight with all our might against any attempt to enact exception laws against the foreign born workers. Our aim will always be to bring together the entire working class of the country, foreign born and native, on the economic field and on the political, for a common struggle against the capitalists and their government.

14. Shall we adopt the scheme of the Secretary of Labor, Davis, for selective immigration?

Republican Party.—We should, of course. The sooner the better. Because this scheme means giving into the hands of the capitalists the full power to determine the kind and the number of new workers to be admitted into the country. Particularly because this scheme for selective immigration will enable the capitalists and their government to close the gate to those workers from overseas who are "tainted" with unionism and with a fighting spirit against capitalism. These troublesome workers we can easily exclude on the patriotic ground that they offer poor racial material for Americanization.

Democratic Party.—The same attitude.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—Gompers says, yes. We have got to select our new immigrants in such a way as to exclude all those which are likely to become militant fighters in the cause of labor. These fellows are almost certain to join the left-wing and become a nuisance to the "regular" leadership of the American Federation of Labor. LaFollette and the Socialists have not yet made up their mind.

Workers Party.—No. We are opposed to the scheme for selective immigration, and for precisely the same reasons that the capitalists and Gompers are in favor of it. Namely, because it will strengthen the capitalists and weaken the workers.

15. Shall we continue to outlaw and persecute the Negroes?

Republican Party.—Yes, but we mustn't say so. Here is what we want. We want the Negroes to be persecuted, terrorized and outraged, preferably with the assistance of white workers. The result will be beneficial to us in three ways. First, a terrified and hounded Negro will consent to work under almost any labor conditions. Second, hatred to the white worker will make of the Negro splendid material for breaking strikes, and for "open shop" campaigns. Third, it will give us a great issue against the Democratic Party.

Democratic Party.—Yes, but it is a pity we can't handle the matter the same way the Republicans do.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—It is a ticklish proposition, so we better keep quiet about it. On this point there is complete unanimity between the Socialists, LaFollette and Gompers.

Workers Party.—No, of course not. We favor the imme-

diate abolition of all civil, political and other limitations imposed upon the Negro by the slave-holding aristocracy of the south and by the capitalists of the country. We favor the most drastic measures against all those guilty of persecuting and outraging Negroes. We shall bend all our energy toward bringing together the white worker and the Negro worker on the economic and on the political field for a common struggle against capitalism.

16. What should be done to relieve the conditions of the unemployed?

Republican Party.—Nothing. The less we bother about the unemployed the better. First, because there is very little we can do without sacrificing part of the profits of the capitalists. Second, because a little unemployment always helps the capitalists to beat down the demands of the workers who are employed, and, third, because no matter what we do for the unemployed, we cannot do away with unemployment without doing away with the capitalist system.

Democratic Party.—The same attitude.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—Our sympathies are all with the unemployed. We wish work could be found for them but really we cannot see how this is to be done, unless through hard and bitter fighting against the capitalists and their government. This, however, we cannot advise, nor can we support it, because we ourselves are just as much afraid of serious class conflicts as are the big capitalists that control the Republican and Democratic Parties.

Workers Party.—The capitalists and their government should be compelled to either find employment for the unemployed (by seizing shut down factories and running them in the interests of the workers, under the latter's control, by inaugurating public works, etc.) or to maintain them and their families at union scale wages. And, as between themselves, the workers should establish the practice of dividing up among themselves all the work in the industry. The unemployed should be organized in special councils of unemployed, which, jointly with the unions, shall fight for the relief of the unemployed.

17. Shall we permit the degeneration of the working class youth which is being caused by the employment and exploitation of child labor?

Republican Party.—Yes. The capitalists must have a constant supply of child labor. It is cheaper and more docile. It helps to beat down the wages of the grown-up worker. As

for the moral and physical degeneration of the working class youth, this is perfectly all right. For the continued rule of the capitalists it is much better that the workers be degenerates than healthy, buoyant, and militant human beings.

Democratic Party.—The same attitude.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—No. We'd rather see child labor abolished, but we must see it through in a regular, constitutional way. We must take our chance on a sufficient number of state legislatures ratifying the constitutional amendment and then on the referendum itself. Meanwhile, a generation of workers may be ruined, but we must be patient and persevering. Justice will triumph in the end.

Workers Party.—No. Child labor must be fought tooth and nail by the entire organized labor movement of the country. The state legislatures will never ratify the constitutional amendment unless driven to it by the organized power of the workers on the economic and political field. Don't be patient. Fight, and fight hard.

18. Shall the workers and poor farmers have a political party of their own, a Farmer-Labor Party?

Republican Party.—No. Political parties are instruments for class struggle. If the workers and poor farmers unite into a party of their own, they will immediately make life very uncomfortable for ourselves as a party, and for the capitalists whom we represent. Eventually, such a farmer-labor party may become a serious contender for power and then the foundations of capitalism will begin to crumble. Particularly if the Farmer-Labor Party will be controlled by the workers, and led by a militant revolutionary leadership. No, we don't want a Farmer-Labor Party. It is too dangerous a proposition.

Democratic Party.—The same attitude.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—No, the Socialists to the contrary notwithstanding. The latter will accept what Gompers and LaFollette propose. As to Gompers and LaFollette both are agreed that a Farmer-Labor Party is no good. Both are at present engaged in destroying whatever little beginning has been made on the road to the formation of such a party. Gompers is opposed to any and all new third parties. He has made it clear that in supporting LaFollette he has not changed one iota his attitude of opposition toward a Farmer-Labor Party. On the contrary, Gompers has wrested from the LaFollette movement complete control over the endorsement over local, state, and congressional candi-

dates, which he disposes of in accord with his old policy of: Rewarding friends and punishing enemies on the ticket of the Republican and Democratic parties. Gompers is opposed to a Farmer-Labor Party for precisely the same reasons as the Republicans and Democrats.

The same or almost the same is true of LaFollette. Though he may desire to have a new third party, he wants that party to be the political expression of small capital and rich farmers. These are the classes he represents and cares for. He knows that the classes which he represents are by themselves not sufficiently numerous to build a big, strong party, for this reason he is extremely anxious to secure the support of the larger masses of workers and poor farmers. He is afraid that if these masses form a party of their own, a Farmer-Labor Party, they will fight their own battles in their own interests, and against the parties of the capitalists, LaFollette's party included. For the moment a Farmer-Labor Party might be much more dangerous to small capital than it would be to big capital. That is why the LaFollette movement is so hostile to a party of workers and poor farmers.

Workers Party.—Yes, by all means. Without a party of their own, politics for the workers becomes a farce. It means helping other classes—big, medium and small capital—to fasten even tighter their grip over the working masses. If the small capitalists and rich farmers want their own party, let them go to it. But the workers and poor farmers have no business in such a combination. They have their own interests to defend, which are antagonistic to the interests of all capitalist groups, big, medium, and little. Therefore, let us have a Farmer-Labor Party.

19. Shall we recognize and resume commercial relations with Soviet Russia?

Republican Party.—No. Soviet Russia is being ruled by a government of workers and poor farmers. This government has come into power as a result of a mighty revolutionary uprising on the part of the toiling masses, determined to uproot capitalism and establish a system of Communist equality and human brotherhood. For this reason the mere existence of the Soviet state becomes a standing challenge to capitalism all over the world, a menace to the foundations of the old order, and an encouragement to the workers of all countries to follow the example of their Russian brothers. To recognize and to resume commercial relations with Soviet Russia is to strengthen the Soviet government of the workers

and farmers and to assist in the upbuilding of the new socialist order in Russia. No, to this we are unalterably opposed. There is only one condition upon which we might consider recognition. Namely, that the Soviet government make such changes in its constitution, and grants such concessions to the American capitalists (control of the railroads, banks, natural resources, and foreign trade) as will surely undermine the power of the workers and poor farmers and will enable the Russian nobility and bourgeoisie together with the American capitalists to become the ruling power in Russia.

Democratic Party.—The same attitude.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—No, and yes. The Socialists are in favor of it. But since this means a political fight which will antagonize the Gompers crowd and the petty bourgeoisie and still further alienate them from the Socialist Party, then the Socialist Party prefers to keep quiet about it.

LaFollette would have no objection to the Soviet government being recognized. In fact, he once favored it because some of the middle and smaller capitalists whom he represents thought they might derive good profits from commercial intercourse with Soviet Russia, which is true even now. But at present LaFollette is running for president, and the parties of big capital are attempting to plaster him "red." LaFollette also feels that Gompers, too, must be pleased. Therefore, LaFollette does what the Socialists do: nothing. He merely keeps quiet.

Gompers is unalterably opposed to it, for the same reasons that the capitalists are, plus one reason of his own, namely, that the recognition of Soviet Russia might strengthen the prestige of the left-wing in the American labor movement, thereby endangering the existence of Gompers and his reactionary machine.

Workers Party.—Yes. The existence and successful development of Soviet Russia means strength and power to the working masses all over the world. The workers and poor farmers of Russia have earned the undying gratitude of the oppressed masses of every other nation by successfully challenging and defeating capitalist rule in their own country and by raising the banner of social revolt throughout the world. Soviet Russia is the only power on earth that works for real peace and brotherhood between the toiling masses of every nation. Soviet Russia is the only power on earth that has renounced every vestige of imperialist ambition, that stands for and practices the principles of complete self determina-

tion of nations, and that lives every day of its life in true accord with the maxim: Live, and let live. To recognize and to resume commercial relations with Soviet Russia also means more work for American industries, and less unemployment for American workers. We favor and stand ready to fight for the complete and unconditional recognition of, and resumption of trade relations with, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

20. Shall we permit the use of the navy, the marines, and the army to enslave other nations in the interests of our capitalists as we now do in the Caribbean and Latin-America, in the Philippines, and in China?

Republican Party.—Yes, because this is the essence of imperialism which in turn is the very life of present day capitalism. Our capitalists want profits. Big profits. Extra profits. They want profits because profits mean power and power means still more profits. They want to enslave and exploit the weaker nations because it brings them a higher rate of profit (extra profit) than can be derived from investments in home industries. By means of these extra profits, our capitalists are enabled to buy off and get the support of certain sections of labor, and of the reactionary labor leaders. Therefore, to forbid the use of the military forces of the country for the enslavement of weaker nations would mean striking a death blow at the very foundations of the capitalist order of society. Yes, we favor the continuation of the old practice which is bringing such splendid results in the Caribbean, in Latin-America, etc.

Democratic Party.—The same attitude. Only when out of office, as we happen to be now, we must speak very loud about our friendship to our little sisters in Latin-America, to our little brothers in China, and to every other nation in the world.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—No. We are opposed to it. Only we do not know how to do away with it, except by denunciation. Or, rather, we do know, but we are not ready to do it. We know that the way to abolish the practice of enslaving weak nations for the aggrandizement of the capitalists of strong nations is not by attacking or denouncing this or that capitalist government, but by overthrowing entirely the rule of capitalism and substituting for it the rule of the workers and poor farmers. But that would mean a social revolution, a proletarian dictatorship, and the total liquidation of the capitalist order of society. And to this—to the rule of

the workers and farmers—we are opposed, just as strongly as the big capitalists are. Therefore, we shall do this: as long as we are out of office, we shall just keep on denouncing the imperialist practice of the Republicans and Democrats, in the certain conviction that they will not listen to us, but, on the contrary, will do all that is necessary to extract from the weak nations enough profits to go around to all the big and small capitalists. Meanwhile, the masses will begin thinking us the better and more honest party, and will put us in office, which, after all, is the only thing we desire from the masses.

Gompers makes the amendment that as far as he is concerned he has absolutely no objections to American capital enslaving other nations. On the contrary, he is very much pleased with it and will, therefore, refrain from even denouncing this practice but if LaFollette and the Socialists think it politically expedient to do a little denouncing he, Gompers, will have no objections.

Workers Party.—No. We are opposed to it, unalterably and irrevocably. We consider this practice the most damnable and outrageous feature of capitalist misrule. We stand for the complete and unconditional right of every nation to independence and self determination. We are pledged to assist the toiling masses in "our" colonial countries with all the means at our disposal to wage a relentless struggle against the yoke of American imperialism. We realize that this practice is part and parcel of capitalist rule and are, therefore, pledged to a fight to the finish with American capitalism and for the establishment of the rule of the workers and poor farmers.

21.—Where do the parties stand on the Dawes plan?

Republican Party.—In favor of it. Because it enables our capitalists "to put their foot" in European affairs. Because it secures for our capitalists, particularly the big ones, a large measure of control over the raw material (coal, iron, etc.) of Germany and Europe generally and thus makes American capitalism one of the most powerful factors in world affairs. In short, because the Dawes plan puts American capitalists in a dominating position in the imperialist politics of the world. Also, because one of the men that were instrumental in putting the thing across, "General" Dawes, is candidate for vice-president on the ticket of our party.

Democratic Party.—In favor of it, only we can't say so because the Republican Party is identified with it. Therefore, we must criticize the Dawes plan. We must do it from the

point of view of the League of Nations, which happens to be our political hobby. We must prove that through the League of Nations American capitalism would have gotten in Europe a better deal than it has through the Dawes plan.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—In favor of it, with the following explanation. We are all substantially agreed (all means Socialists, LaFollette and Gompers) that the Dawes plan is a good thing for American capitalists, which means that if we, the petty bourgeoisie, the rich farmers, the reactionary labor leaders, and the labor aristocracy, exert sufficient pressure upon the big capitalists, they may be compelled to share with us in a certain measure some of the profits that will accrue to American capitalism through the operation of the Dawes plan. That's why we are in favor of it. But, because the Republican candidate for vice-president is identified with it, political expediency would dictate that we criticize the plan just a little bit.

Gompers amends: Inasmuch as I have been identified with Woodrow Wilson in prosecuting the late war and in framing the proposals for the League of Nations, I reserve for myself the right to say a few kind words about the League of Nations.

Socialists amend: Inasmuch as the Dawes plan received the endorsement and support of our Socialist brethren of the Second International, thereby making us partners in the game; and since, on the other hand, the Dawes plan is identified with the Republican Party and big capital, which are supposed to be our enemies, this whole business puts us in a very delicate position. Therefore, we request that whenever the Dawes plan comes up for consideration we be registered: ABSENT.

Workers Party.—Absolutely opposed. The Dawes plan, if it succeeds at all, will spell the still further enslavement of the workers of the entire world. With this plan in operation American capitalism is firmly entrenching itself in the affairs of the world. This will result in increased armaments, on land, sea, and in the air. It will make imminent a new bloody conflict for which the American working class will again have to pay with thousands upon thousands of human lives. We are opposed to the Dawes plan as we are opposed to American imperialism and to the further rule of American capitalism.

22. What is their attitude to imperialist wars?

Republican Party.—In favor of them. But we don't call

them imperialist wars. We prefer not to talk of war at all, except to say that in case we are attacked, we shall, of course, have to defend ourselves. And for this we must be prepared. It goes, however, without saying that whenever we happen to be at war, it is the other fellow that is the aggressor, not ourselves. Meanwhile, we have got to increase our navy, air and military forces, so that we can successfully carry on the imperialist business of the American capitalists. Above all, we must make use of our control of the press, pulpit, movies, theatres, schools, etc., to instill into the masses a sense of loyalty to "their" country and to educate them to the necessity of making the "supreme sacrifice" in case we see fit to engage in a new war. All this bloody business, in order to be effective, must be carefully and skillfully camouflaged with such verbiage as "patriotism," "democracy," "open door," "Americanism," and such other slogans as the situation may demand.

Democratic Party.—The same attitude.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—No, of course not. We are pacifists. We don't believe in the bloody barbaric way of settling international conflicts. We are in favor of declaring war outlawed. However, we must realize that the world we live in is not yet ideal, that there are other nations that still believe in war, and that we may be provoked even against our will to enter a new war. Should this come about, we shall, of course, have to defend our country, our flag, and our homes.

Workers Party.—No. We are opposed to any and all imperialist wars. We can see now how the American capitalists are preparing a new world conflict. We know that when this bloody thing finally comes, it will be presented by the capitalists as an attack by some foreign power (England or Japan, or somebody else) upon our liberty and independence. We do not propose to be deceived or fooled by any such talk. We also realize that under the rule of capitalism there is no earthly power to prevent a new imperialist war. Therefore, we are pledged to fight capitalism to the death and at the first outbreak of a new imperialist war, to attempt to transform it into civil war against the rule of capital and for the establishment of a workers and farmers government.

23. Where do they stand on reduction of armaments?

Republican Party.—Opposed to it for the simple reason that imperialism without militarism and navalism is a joke and we do not propose to play jokes with the most vital in-

terests of American capitalism. That's why we favor the biggest navy and the biggest air fleet. Also as much preparedness for conscripting a standing army in time of emergency as is compatible with political expediency. Which, however, does not mean that we are going to cry from the house tops that we oppose reduction of armaments. Just the contrary is true. We shall permit no one to outdistance us in love for peace and disarmament. We shall even favor the calling by the American government of international conferences for the reduction of armament, particularly if the American government will be in the hands of the Republican Party, but we shall know all the while that this is mere camouflage to cover up our real and secret preparations for a new war.

Democratic Party.—The same attitude with this amendment. That we would rather see such peace conferences called by a Democratic administration.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—We favor reduction of armaments, by international action. That is, we favor that the capitalist governments of the world come together to fool the people with talk about reducing armaments. Farther than that, we cannot go.

Workers Party.—In favor of it. But we have not the least trust in the ability or desire of the capitalist governments to reduce armaments. We put our trust in the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed masses. We are pledged to fight militarism to the death and to refuse a single penny to the capitalist governments for any sort of military expenditures.

24. What international organization do they favor to secure peace and security to the toiling masses of the world?

Republican Party.—We are not concerned with the peace and security of the toiling masses. We are concerned with the profits and power of the American capitalists. To ensure the steady flow of profits to our capitalists and to facilitate the extension of their imperialist power over the world, we favor the active participation of our government in international affairs. For the present we find it more expedient to pursue the above end directly through the medium of our bankers, with the government acting in their support in a semi-official manner. In time we might favor even an international organization of capitalist governments, some sort of a League of Nations, provided it can be dominated by the American capitalists. That would be for us the most ideal way of ruling the world. We realize, however, that time is bringing to the forefront of world affairs, other kinds of inter-

nationals, for instance, the Second Socialist International, and the Communist International. Should things come to such a pass when the latter remain the only two international organizations in the field (and that is quite probable) then we should favor supporting the Socialist International as against the Communist International, because the former accepts the capitalist order of society and the very important principle that in time of international conflicts each national Socialist party must stand by the interests of its own capitalist class. Also because the Second International backs the Dawes Plan thus assisting us in securing control over the world.

Democratic Party.—Practically the same attitude, except that we must maintain that the League of Nations, championed by our party, is the most effective instrument of international organization for American capitalists.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—We are not quite united on that. The Socialists favor their own Second International because, they say, it manages to combine both essentials of international organization, namely, the protection of the capitalist interests of each nation, and their peaceful cooperation in the interests of the whole. The Socialists also claim (not publicly, of course) that their international is the most effective weapon for checking the rising tide of social revolution and for combatting the prowling influence of the Communist International.

LaFollette realizes the merits of the Socialist argument, but for reasons of political expediency (a desire not to alienate from his movement some of his capitalist supporters) prefers to be vague on the entire proposition. Consequently, he favors common international action by the capitalist government to effect the economic recovery of the world, which means the Dawes plan, the League of Nations, the Hague Tribunal, or any other such thing.

Gompers is more inclined to take the view of the Democratic party, particularly since it in no substantial way contradicts the position of LaFollette and the Socialists.

Workers Party.—We favor the Communist International as the only world organization willing and able to fight capitalist imperialism to a finish and to erect on its ruins an international federation of socialist soviet republic, thereby removing the only menace to the peace and security of the toiling masses of the world.

25. What is their attitude toward the Ku Klux Klan?

Republican Party.—In favor of it. Because the Ku Klux Klan may in time become indispensable for the maintenance of capitalist rule in the United States. That is to say, when the working masses of the country will realize their own interests, will cease to follow the lead of the Republicans, Democrats and LaFollette—that is, the lead of big and small capital—will form a party of their own and will earnestly begin to fight for the emancipation of their own class, then we shall be compelled to resort to the same means of rule as Mussolini's in Italy. We shall have to abandon all pretenses to democracy and freedom and suppress the workers by pure fascism and White Terror. For this we must be prepared. We are, therefore, determined to support and encourage by all possible means the further growth of the Ku Klux Klan as the reserve army for the maintenance of capitalist rule in time of emergency. For the present, however, we favor keeping the Ku Klux Klan in the background so as not to expose our plans prematurely and not to alienate from our party the sympathies of certain sections of the population.

Democratic Party.—In favor of it, and for the same reasons as the Republican party, only we must be much more careful than the Republicans in supporting the Klan, because the strength of our party depends a good deal upon the support of large masses of Catholics.

Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers alliance.—Mildly opposed to it, on the main ground that the Ku Klux Klan is developing into a competitor to our own movement. The Klan maintains that the present capitalist order of society is in danger. So do we. The Klan claims that in order to remove this danger and to assure definitely the further existence of capitalism in the United States some extraordinary measures must be applied. We claim the very same thing. Where we differ is merely in this: The Klan proposes to discard immediately all pretense to democracy, which is no longer sufficient as a means of maintaining capitalist rule, and to inaugurate a system of Fascism and White Terror. While our contention is that if big capital makes some concessions to small capital, to the well-to-do farmers, to the labor bureaucrats and only to a small section of the labor aristocracy, we might yet succeed in avoiding the necessity for introducing the methods of fascism. Still better, if Big Capital would let us (the alliance of Socialist-LaFollette-Gompers) become the government of the United States. Because we stand nearer to the masses

than Big Capital does, and because our prestige among the masses has not yet been shattered as badly as that of the other capitalist parties we make the following claim: that with the government in our hands, capitalism in the United States would be much safer than if political affairs were managed through the other two capitalist parties. In short, here is our main contention. We claim to be the only political group capable of saving capitalism in the United States. The Ku Klux Klan makes the same claims. The fortunes of both of us depend in a large measure upon whom capitalism in the United States will eventually support, us or the Klan. Consequently, the Ku Klux Klan is our competitor. Therefore, we are opposed to it. But, should the toiling masses get out of hand and become totally unmanageable by the means of present-day capitalist democracy, we shall, of course, support the Klan wholeheartedly.

Workers Party.—Unreservedly opposed to it. We look upon the Ku Klux Klan as upon the "shock troops" of capitalism which will be used against the workers any time the latter will enter into serious conflicts with their bosses. The Klan has already become the mobilization ground for all kinds of scabs, strike-breakers, open shoppers, and enemies of labor generally. The Klan is nothing else than the extension on a much wider scale of such old and familiar institutions as company gunmen, labor spy agencies and similar auxiliaries of capitalist exploitation. The workers should be prepared to find the Klan breaking strikes, destroying unions, persecuting radicals and rendering all kinds of "volunteer" service to the capitalists in their fight against the labor movement. The Klan is a menace to the well-being and even life of every worker and poor farmer in the United States. The Klan must be fought just as energetically as any other agency of capitalist oppression.